

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-20, 22 and 23 are currently pending, No claims have been added, amended or cancelled. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in view of the remarks presented herein below.

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-20, 22 and 23 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2003/0056026 A1 (hereinafter “Anuff”) and Kanevsky et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. U.S. 2002/0089546 A1 (hereinafter “Kanevsky”) in view of Olander, U.S. Patent Publication No. U.S. 2005/0005243 A1 (hereinafter “Olander”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

On page 3 of the current final rejection Office Action, the Examiner admits that while Anuff teaches defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages of navigations structure of a site (see paragraph 133) it does not specifically state a framework with a plurality of containers configured to accept one or more modules of containers. Furthermore, the Examiner has attempted to correct deficiencies of Anuff with Olander by alleging Olander teaches the customization of web pages and their corresponding links (see, for example paragraphs 25, 30 and 32 of Olander) and as being similar to that of Anuff, but further teaches in paragraphs 28, 34 and recited in claims 1 and 9 there exists a framework where controls (tables) serve as containers for other controls, setting up a system with a plurality of tables with an embedded set of containers.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has misapplied the specific teachings of Olander and Applicants maintain that Olander fails to overcome the deficiencies with regards to Anuff. Furthermore, even if one skilled in the art were motivated to combine Anuff with Olander, which Applicants do not concede, the combination would still fail to render obvious at least the independent claims, since the control tables generally discussed in Olander are vastly different and distinguishable from a framework that includes a plurality of containers, as recited in Applicants’ claimed invention. Therefore, even if one skilled in the art were motivated to combine Anuff and Olander, which Applicants do not concede, the combination

would still fail to render the claimed invention obvious, and specifically for example, as recited in independent claim 1.

In addition, the Examiner characterizes Olander on page 4 of the final rejection Office Action by stating that the current claimed invention would have been rendered obvious if one skilled in the art was presented with Olander and Olander's general discussion to modify the adaptable pane system of Anuff include the embedded control tables of Olander. Applicants respectfully assert that this over-generalization has mischaracterized at least one vital aspect of Applicants' claimed invention which is the flexibility and seemingly transparent framework which in operation only presents to the user those instantiated functional objects that are generated from the framework that includes a plurality of containers.

The Examiner also attempts to correct the combination of Anuff and Olander with his cited teachings of Kanevsky for reformatting a specific graphical user interface (GUI). See, for example, final Office Action, page 4.

However, the Applicants respectfully assert that for at least the same reasons with regards to the combination of Anuff with Olander failing to render Applicants' claimed invention obvious, the Applicants also point to the similar failings of the combination of Kanevsky with Olander and Anuff. Specifically Anuff, Olander and Kanevsky each individually or in combination fail to disclose or suggest a framework that includes a plurality of containers configured to accept one or more modules, wherein if one of said plurality of containers does not contain a module, the container shrinks thereby effectively disappearing when the user interface is displayed as claimed. Therefore, even if one skilled in the art or motivated to combine Anuff, Olander, and Kanevsky, which again the Applicants do not concede the combination would still fail to render obvious Applicants claimed invention.

Specifically, since Anuff, Olander and Kanevsky each individually or in combination fail to disclose or suggest a framework that includes a plurality of containers, clearly any conceivable combination would similarly fail to disclose or suggest the same containers shrinking thereby effectively disappearing when not containing a module when the user interface is displayed.

For at least the reasons discussed above, independent claims 1, 8 and 19 are clearly distinguishable over the combination of Anuff, Kanevsky and Olander. Similarly, claims 2-3, 5-

7, 9-13, 15-18, 20, and 22-23 which depend from independent claims 1, 8 and 19 respectively, are also distinguishable over the combination of Anuff, Kanevsky and Olander by virtue of their dependency as well as the additional recitations contained therein.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-20, 22 and 23 under section 103 over Anuff, Kanevsky and Olander.

### CONCLUSION


All matters having been addressed in view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the immediate allowance of all pending claims.

Applicants' undersigned representative remains ready to assist the Examiner in any way to facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this matter. If any point remains an issue in which the Examiner feels would be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account No. 02-2448. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any overpayments to the above-referenced deposit account.

Dated: September 11, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By  46463  
per Michael K. Mutter WILLIAM TITZOMB  
Registration No.: 29,680  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant